

## 11-13-14: Summary of Technical Meeting on Water Quality (Salinity and Bromide)

**Issue:** Was any additional modeling and/or analysis conducted by the lead agencies?

**Decision:** Yes; sensitivity analysis results are presented as outputs from the CALSIM and DSM2 models.

**Next steps:** DWR putting together some sort of memo or addendum to show visuals and explanations of what they did.

**Issue:** EPA concern that modeling shows persistent violations of water quality standards in the Delta related to salinity and chloride.

**Decision:** The apparent violations of WQS were attributed to "modeling artifacts", Emmaton compliance locations, and assumptions about Suisun Marsh (removable salinity barriers, restoration footprints).

These modeling issues will be brought forward and clarified in the SDEIS where ICF/DWR will make their case that impacts to WQS are less than significant or mitigatable.

**Issue:** EPA concern that project would worsen water quality for users who divert water directly from the Delta, including increasing bromide around the North Bay Aqueduct intake at Barker Slough.

**Decision:** Consultants (Ben) will develop new language and additional analysis about modeling scenarios and Barker Slough.

**Issue:** EPA concerned that DEIS does not report compliance with flow-related D-1641 objectives.

**Decision:** ICF and modeling consultants built into CALSIM the D-1641 objectives as the most important WQ element. That apparently wasn't clear so, in the interest of full disclosure, they will add language about this modeling parameter to the SDEIS. We would like to see more information about these inputs so this issue is not totally resolved.

**Next steps:** EPA needs to figure out what we want to see about the inputs to know they are always met.

**Issue:** EPA concerned that DEIS does not explain why higher outflows result in higher salinity concentrations for Alternative 8 relative to Alternative 7.

**Decision:** Alt 8 is designed to ensure recuperation of reservoir storage levels and therefore doesn't contain outflow requirements for summer and fall. The way the Alternative was presented in the DEIS could be misinterpreted.

**Next step:** Stephanie and Erin will caucus with modelers on needed clarification or documentation needs for the SDEIS.

**Issue:** EPA is concerned about how the Rio Vista minimum flows will be met and how the State Board's current process for revisions to the WQCP has been integrated into the BDCP.

**Decision:** BDCP assumes JAN-SEPT compliance period whereas D-1641 is confined to outflows in spring and September only. ICF adding language about how project will be compatible with any WQCP changes.

**Issue:** What mitigation measures are available to mitigate to avoid impacts?

**Decision:** "mitigation wetlands" for WQ impacts will be sited in specific locations and designed to create circulation and hydrodynamic conditions necessary to buffer or decrease potential violations of WQS. [Tim's note to self; this seems unrealistic].

**Issue:** Will all wq objectives be evaluated?

**Decision:** Yes, but some are fed into the model so how this point is communicated in the EIS is still unresolved.